



**Los Rios Community College District
District Academic Senate
2017-2018**

DAS President,, Carlos López
 ARC President...Gary Aguilar
 CRC President...Shannon Mills
 FLC President...Paula Haug
 SCC President...Gayle Pitman

District Office
 Main Conference Room
 Tuesday, September 4, 2018
 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Approved Minutes

Roster			
Carlos Lopez	FLC	DAS President	X
Dan Crump	ARC	DAS Secretary	X
Gary Aguilar	ARC	AS President	X
Alisa Shubb	ARC	AS Vice President	X
Janay Lovering	ARC	AS Secretary	X
Tressa Tabares	ARC	AS Past President	Excused
Shannon Mills	CRC	AS President	X
Constance Carter	CRC	AS Vice President	X
Donnisha Lugo	CRC	AS Secretary	
Julie Oliver	CRC	AS Past President	
Paula Haug	FLC	AS President	X
Tina Royer	FLC	AS Vice President	X
Francis Fletcher	FLC	AS Secretary	X
Gayle Pitman	SCC	AS President	X
Lori Petite	SCC	AS Vice President	X
Sandra Guzman	SCC	AS Secretary	
Troy Myers	SCC	AS Past President	X
Dyan Pease	SCC	District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC)	X
Alice Dieli	ARC	District Educational Technology Committee (DETC)	X

Angelena Lambert	SCC	District Matriculation & Student Success Committee (DMSSC)	X
Robert Perrone		Los Rios Colleges Federation of Teachers (LRCFT)	X
Guests:			
Jamey Nye	DO	Vice Chancellor, Education & Technology	
Tammy Montgomery	DO	Associate Vice Chancellor, Instruction	
Robin Ikegami	SCC	Interim Dean, Language & Literature	
KC Boylan	FLC	Speech Faculty; LRCFT Chief Negotiator	
Doug Herndon	ARC	Dean, English	
Sue A Rooney	ARC	Reading Faculty	
Shannon Pries	ARC	Reading Faculty	
Leah Arambel	ARC	Reading Faculty	
John Seamons	CRC	Reading Faculty	
Makeba Rangel	SCC	Reading Faculty	
Ginny McReynolds	SCC	Interim Associate Vice President, Instruction	
Maureen Dana	SCC	English Faculty	
Jennifer Laflam	ARC	Reading Faculty	

Preliminaries

1. Call to Order

- Introduction of Guests
- Approval of the Agenda---approved by consensus
- Announcements---Lopez has a Doodle poll for senate presidents and LRCFT leadership to arrange a meeting time
- Public Comment (3 minutes per person as time permits)---none

Information Items

1. Fall 2018 Senate Retreat Details

Friday, September 7

Decision Items

Discussion Items

1. Jamey Nye and Tammy Montgomery visit DAS to discuss Impact of AB705 Implementation on Reading

Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology

Summary of comments to District Academic Senate

AB 705 & Reading

Before I begin I want to acknowledge how disruptive and unsettling receiving my August 10th memo about the future of reading must have been for reading faculty. I gave much thought about waiting until faculty returned for the fall semester to share the direct guidance we received from the State Chancellor's Office. However, I also felt a strong obligation to share this information with Senate and LRCFT leadership and with the faculty being most directly affected by this guidance. Ultimately, withholding critical information that faculty had a right to know for an entire month did not seem like the best course of action. On August 8th, I shared Executive Vice Chancellor Alice Perez's direct guidance and a draft memo on the implications for Los Rios with the Academic Senate Presidents who supported my decision to share this information with reading faculty as soon as possible—even as they acknowledged that the news would be unsettling. I appreciate the feedback I have already received from reading faculty. I want to acknowledge their professionalism and collegiality in asking questions, advocating for students, and thinking creatively about options for AB 705 implementation.

Further, through the LRCCD/LRCFT steering committee, we have created a joint task group to prepare for transitioning reading faculty into other departments. As we are seeing this semester, some reading faculty are already not making load in reading due to AB 705 and are therefore teaching in other disciplines. We have an obligation to these faculty to ensure that any transition to teaching in another department is as smooth as possible.

For this meeting, in addition to calming fears and hearing your questions/concerns/input, I would like to address three topics:

1. AB 705 as it pertains to reading.
2. Why I recommend combining reading and writing competency this semester.
3. Faculty purview and process related to AB 705.

Four Key Principles:

1. We all have the best interest of our students as the foundation for any actions we support for implementing AB 705 in reading.
2. Curricular matters, including reading competency, are clearly the purview of faculty.
3. While curricular matters are the purview of faculty, as the Vice Chancellor of Education, and as the administrative liaison to the DCCC and co-chair of the districtwide AB 705 implementation coordination workgroup, I have a responsibility to share input and recommendations regarding curricular matters that I believe are in the best interest of our students and faculty.
4. Finally, considering new ideas and approaches to serving students and addressing equity gaps is critical to our work as educators. In these efforts, we can disagree while maintaining positive and productive relationships in a spirit of collegiality—in short relationships matter.

AB 705 & Reading

- In their July 11th AB 705 Implementation memo, Laura Hope, Executive Vice Chancellor, and John Stankas, President ASCCC, state that “although AB 705 does not expressly discuss reading, if reading courses are part of the pathway to transfer-level English courses, then they are clearly part of the one-year curricular design sequence.”
- According to this guidance, the Chancellor’s Office sees reading courses as a pathway into transfer-level English. They do not view reading as a separate pathway or course sequence similar to math and English but rather assume reading courses are preparing students to enter and be successful in college-level writing and other transfer-level courses. This helps explain the direct guidance from Alice Perez, which I will address momentarily, that Freshman Composition assumes reading competency.
- Since the guidance assumes that reading courses are developmental in nature and are pathways into transfer-level courses, no through-put numbers or recommended GPA cutoffs are provided for the completion of a transfer-level reading course. That is, the Chancellor’s Office is not measuring completion in reading. Rather, they are measuring completion, or through-put, in college writing, math, and ESL.
- Based on Chancellor’s Office guidance, implementing a model in reading similar to a model in English or math is not part of the AB 705 framework. Their recommendations are for reading to be part of co-curricular supports to ensure students are prepared to enter and complete English writing.
- While some may dismiss the Chancellor’s Office guidance on reading simply as a suggestion, the Chancellor’s Office has indicated that their guidance will soon be supported with changes in Title 5, CB 21 codes, and other regulatory language to support their interpretation of AB 705. From my vantage point, whether you agree with the Chancellor’s Office guidance or not, Freshman Composition will be deemed as meeting reading competency. The local control over reading competency in Title 5 might remain in some form, but this will be in the form of other options, in addition to Freshman Composition, by which students can meet reading competency such as GPA requirements. Under this model, stand-alone reading courses would not be the way that the vast majority of students would meet reading competency.

Reasons for Recommending that ENG 300 Meets Reading Competency Effective spring 2019:

1. In their July 11th memo, Laura Hope and John Stankas state that “the community college system has been moving increasingly toward integrated instruction of reading and writing, with fewer than 20 colleges maintaining separate reading departments.” Of the 19 colleges statewide referenced in the implementation memo that have separate reading and writing departments, 7 have already integrated. Outside of Los Rios, of the remaining 9 colleges, 6 are currently integrating, 2 are awaiting additional guidance (but these have only 1-2 reading faculty), and a single small college is keeping a separate reading department but anticipates dwindling enrollment as they implement AB 705 .
2. Additionally, no other colleges statewide outside of Los Rios still maintain a transfer-level reading course to meet reading competency. This is one reason we did not originally receive clear guidance on reading—because Los Rios is very much an outlier compared to the rest of the state in having separate sequential reading courses that lead to a transfer-level reading course to meet reading competency.

3. The guidance memo goes on to state that “the intent of the law is to ensure students’ educational progress is not protracted by inappropriate placement into remediation. . . . Additionally, while the demonstration of reading skills is a requirement for students earning a local Associate’s Degree, that requirement can be met a number of ways. Colleges are encouraged to explore a variety of best practices to verify that students possess these skills before they graduate.” Again, from the viewpoint of the Chancellor’s Office, stand-alone reading courses are developmental in nature. Requiring students who do not test out of reading competency (or have a 3.2 GPA) to take a stand-alone reading course to meet reading competency is viewed as protracting students’ educational progress by requiring unnecessary remediation.
4. To expand on this point, following the MMAP guidance for English writing, according to the Chancellor’s Office, we would need to demonstrate with research data that students who are required to complete a two-semester sequence including a stand-alone reading course (e.g. ENGRD 310 or ENGRD 312 and English 300) are more likely to complete English 300 than students being placed directly into English 300. Certainly this would not be the case. Of course this example assumes, as the Chancellor’s Office does, that Freshman Composition meets reading competency.
5. Another reason for recommending that English 300 meets reading competency is that we have direct guidance from the Chancellor’s Office: Alice Perez, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, provided the District with the State Chancellor’s Office position on reading competency. She states that “successful completion of transfer-level English Composition in our system assumes college-level reading proficiency as well as writing proficiency.” According to Perez, historically some colleges have offered “discrete pre-college level Reading courses--but there is no Title 5 mandate requiring college-level Reading.”
6. As already stated, changes to Title 5 and CB 21 codes related to AB 705 are imminent: “Future efforts related to implementation of the law include regulatory language in title 5 that reflects the basic tenets as well as a revision of the CB-21 coding within the MIS system. It is also relevant to note that eligibility for both AB 19 and guided pathways funding are contingent upon compliance with AB 705.”
7. More to the point of why we should do this now instead of waiting for Title 5 or other regulatory changes: Reading enrollments are already down due to AB 705 implementation and not placing students into developmental reading courses. This makes it very difficult to schedule classes and manage teaching loads for reading faculty. In my opinion, this uncertainty for reading faculty is less desirable and more disruptive than making the change now while we still have the ability to be proactive rather than reactive. Further, by scheduling and then cancelling reading courses because of low enrollments, we are negatively impacting those students who are seeking developmental support in reading. I would argue that developing co-curricular reading support is a more effective way to serve those students who truly need developmental work in reading.
8. Finally, even with the current Los Rios reading competency requirements, as more student pursue ADTs, a pathway incentivized in the new funding formula, the need for stand-alone reading courses will diminish. With increasing enrollments in ADTs and the implementation of AB 705, our current structure of 20 full-time reading faculty is unsustainable.

As previously stated, curricular matters are faculty purview. In the context of AB 705, however, the Chancellor's Office is offering guidance, and in the case of MMAP through-put, directives on the implementation of AB 705.

To answer the question, why did we ask the Chancellor's Office for additional clarification regarding reading and AB 705? As mentioned earlier, the Chancellor's Office has provided limited guidance about reading. At the same time, they openly stated in public forums throughout the spring semester and over the summer that English and reading departments should be integrated, that reading courses are assumed to be developmental, that reading courses support students' entry into English writing, that reading should not be a separate required sequence of courses, and that students should not be placed into stand-alone reading courses.

As such, asking for clarification was necessary for implementing AB 705 in reading. Further, asking for clarification is not uncommon and in no way violates our Los Rios processes.

On the topic of process, as a former Academic Senate President, I value shared governance and 10+1, and I recognize and honor faculty primacy over curriculum. Our well-established curriculum processes have served Los Rios well over the years.

However, AB 705 adds a new layer of complexity to our curriculum and competency processes because now our English, math, and ESL course sequences are being measured against state-determined standards—which include time to completion and through-put. If we do not meet those targets, then we will be compelled to adopt the statewide model without any modifications. Historically, our curriculum and competency processes have not had to account for these outside factors. Notably, reading is not even included in the MMAP model.

For reading, we need to ensure that our processes for implementing AB 705 and determining reading competency do not prevent us from complying with the law. Further, we need to ensure that current processes do not unnecessarily preserve the status quo, which disproportionately impacts students of color, or prevent us from doing things differently in support of equity and student success.

As Laura Hope and John Stankas state in their memo, "Even more than compliance, however, the colleges have an unprecedented opportunity to improve the opportunity and access for students while simultaneously addressing stubborn inequities within our system that disadvantage those students who need educational opportunity the most. The California Community Colleges are at the very beginning stages of this work together, and moving forward, the Chancellor's Office and the Academic Senate are urging innovative practices, courageous conversation, and rigorous evaluation."

The conversation that we are having today is indeed a courageous conversation. We are asking important but difficult questions about reading requirements and competency. Based on Chancellor's Office guidance, we are contemplating the integration of reading and English and the transition of reading faculty into other disciplines. We are reexamining a system and structure within reading that has been in place for many years, and we are confronting the reality that following current processes may not result in compliance with AB 705. These are challenging conversations, but I am confident that we can work through them together with equity and student success as the foundation of any decisions we make.

In closing and on a personal note, I truly respect and value the faculty in this room and across Los Rios. I am honored to serve as your Vice Chancellor, and I also have fond memories of sitting in this very room as an Academic Senate President and doing good work in support of our students. In my role as Vice Chancellor, as was the case when I was a Senate President, I continue to value shared governance, faculty primacy in curricular matters, equity and student success, and collegial decision-making. Thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to share my perspective on these issues. I look forward to our conversation.

Nye also gave thanks to Montgomery and reading faculty for their work in the Reading workgroup over the summer. He also noted that Montgomery, Perrone, Herndon, Myers and Rooney (all in attendance at this meeting) are also on the current workgroup.

Jamey---mentioned initial placement data that he had also presented to senate presidents---7400 eligible for placement, 10,400 this fall.

English 48% last fall, 68% this fall for transfer level

Math. 9.4%, 56% for transfer level

Discussion after Nye's opening statement:

Q: Will there be a discussion of other courses to meet the writing competency requirement for local degrees?

A: Not at this time really since ENGWR 300 is required for all degrees---both local degrees and the associate degrees for transfer.

Faculty --want to clarify Title 5 requirement for reading; does state that it should be locally determined. It is rare to find faculty that have the specific reading degree. To equate SLOs of writing course with reading is not appropriate. There is a difference in the transfer-level reading course as opposed to ENGWR 300. ENGRD 310 and 312 are helpful to students in classes other than ENGWR 300.

Faculty---Statement that there are other colleges that offer transfer-level reading courses.

Montgomery responded that she has been contacting colleges across the state. There are several colleges that offer transfer-level reading courses, but only one other district (Solano) that requires a transfer-level reading course.

Faculty---many colleges do have a 4-unit integrated course. Concern about the time frame for developing an integrated writing-reading course.

Faculty---personal opinion that we don't want the good things that reading faculty are doing for students with their coursework. Frustrated that one or two people at District Office are not using collegial consultation. The pace feels aggressive. Students are not wasting time in their reading courses.

Nye---his feeling that we have direct guidance from the state Chancellor's Office. This is a suggested timeline. If we change the course requirement for the reading competency for local degrees (i.e. ENGWR 300), it will impact enrollment in reading courses. He also feels there will be changes in Title 5 soon to address/clarify reading competency requirements.

Faculty---what about resources like Reading Across the Disciplines (RAD)? Need models that show students do as well with these resources as those students who are placed directly into ENGWR 300. Montgomery responded that RAD is integral to everything we do and more similar resources will probably be developed.

Faculty---discussion with reading faculty on Convocation Day and discussed at SCC academic senate meeting today. This feels like a *fait accompli*. Nye responded that Jamey that he that the Chancellor's Office feels it will go that way.

Faculty---after the Convocation meeting, someone made an insightful comment that academic senate is being forced to respond in a reactive model as opposed to discussing the lack of collegial consultation. Nye responded that he doesn't see that process (be it actual or in the spirit) was not followed. His opinion is that the communication from the Chancellor's Office was a directive---"this is how it is going to be." He values consultation. If we have processes that will be fruitless in the end, then we need to look at the process. Do we control over this decision or has it already been made? If we already know the end, it will make collegial consultation feel very hollow.

Faculty---referring to Nye's letter---"District will be working with Academic Senate and District Curriculum." There is a concern about the change to the reading competency (i.e. ENGWR 300) beginning in Spring 2019. Concern about time for curricular changes to ENGWR 300 to meet both the reading and writing competencies. Nye was open to discussions about the timeline.

Faculty---we need to develop an integrated course that is best for the student. Concern that reading components will be included with the writing and nothing will change to writing.

Faculty---feeling that ENGWR 300 as it is currently constructed would not meet the reading competency. Time is needed for the revision of ENGWR 300. There is a fundamental difference between integrated courses as opposed to standalone reading and writing courses.

Faculty---noted text from page 9 of the Hope/Stanskas memo of July 11) that states--- For English, reading skills development will likely play a prominent role in any redesign plans. Although AB 705 does not expressly discuss reading, if reading courses are part of the pathway to transfer level English courses, then they are clearly part of the one-year curricular design sequence. Overall, the community college system has been moving increasingly toward integrated instruction of reading and writing, with fewer than 20 colleges maintaining separate reading departments. The intent of the law is to ensure students' educational progress is not protracted by inappropriate placement into remediation. For colleges with separate reading and English courses, one option may be to consider an emphasis on integrated reading and writing pedagogy within transfer-level English composition and revising course outlines to include reading faculty as discipline-qualified to teach co-curricular support courses or activities. It is important that reading and English faculty collaborate in the creation of a curricular design and support structure that serves the needs of students and complies with the law. Another approach may be to integrate reading instruction into co-requisite and/or support infrastructures for students who may have more of these needs. Additionally, while the demonstration of reading skills is a requirement for students earning a local Associate's Degree, that requirement can be met a number of ways. Colleges are encouraged to explore a variety of best practices to verify that students possess these skills before they graduate."

Faculty---what is the district going to do to provide services (e.g. time, space) to work on the revision of ENGWR 300?

Lopez---suggestion that workgroups for reading and writing to take the lead in the revision of ENGWR 300.

Faculty---"throughput" is an important metric, but it is not the only metric. What is happening across the state to colleges that are using the recommended metrics?

Montgomery---there is an urgency in falling off of enrollment in reading. We need to make sure that our reading faculty meet their unit load. There are faculty that currently have reassign time to work on some of this.

Faculty---back to collegial consultation. It is baffling that guidelines are coming before Title 5 regulations and there are concerns that these guidelines are in conflict to current Title 5 regulations. At what point, do we collectively come to the arena where collegial consultation is honored? We have both senate and union issues that need to be addressed.

Nye noted that AB 705 has interpretations that change Title 5---he gave example of the development of associate degrees for transfer (ADT).

Faculty---mention of research study of changes in developmental education because of SB 1720 (Florida)---
<http://centerforpostsecondarysuccess.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/StudentDataReport2016-1.pdf>.

Nye noted that more students will get through the English and math requirements because there are more students in the pool of students that are starting transfer-level courses. And a faculty member noted that they are not surprised that the success rates might go down, but that there will more students taking the course and actually completing.

Faculty---re: reading faculty loads. Not an issue at ARC, where is it an issue?

Montgomery noted that, at two of the colleges, some of the lower-level reading courses were not filling so that was more ENGRD 310 courses were added. She also noted the concern that students would take ENGRD 310 to satisfy CSU A-3 and it doesn't work---students need to take a second course in English composition. Sac State needs to take a second semester of composition.

It was noted that two SCC reading faculty did not make load and that some reading faculty at FLC had asked not to be scheduled for reading courses for fear of not making load.

Faculty---noted that there has been a lot of pushback from counselors that there is a need for lower-level reading courses. What commitment does the district have to really thinking about students need to be successful?

Nye responded that we can't require students to be placed and take the course, but absolutely, students can make the option of taking a standalone reading course.

Lopez---next steps

Two components

1. Transition of faculty---LRCFT issue
2. Integrating reading/writing curriculum

Lopez response to question about collegial consultation. We have to strongly consider the guidance which might become law (guidelines for math and writing state that the intention is for those to become law).

Nye noted that if we don't have an ENGWR 300 course that meets reading competency, we might have a compliance issue with the CO.

- Propose joint meeting of reading and writing faculty.
- Concern about timeline---might we look for Fall 2019 as opposed to Spring 2019?
- Competency needs to go through Chancellor's Cabinet.
- What is the role of the Reading Competency Committee? Do they determine courses to satisfy reading competency or do they also determine what determines reading competency?
- Faculty---feels that the Los Rios administrative role is to advocate to the Chancellor's Office for time to revise ENGWR 300 and to speak up for Los Rios faculty to the Chancellor's Office.

- Nye---we are an “outlier” district because we don’t have ENG1A (i.e. 300) as satisfying reading competency and we have a transfer-level reading course as one of the ways to satisfy reading competency. Asking for an additional semester is reasonable---there is some “wobble room.” Go back to having consultation, but the final result is ending up with state mandated requirement of ENGWR 300 for satisfying reading competency.
- Lopez---need to have appointments to RCCC asap.
- Nye---would like to propose change of process. We usually ask faculty member to bring a course for competency. Can we just agree that DAS put forward ENGWR 300 to be considered for reading competency? Have the reading/writing workgroups to be involved in the collaboration discussion about ENGWR 300.
- Faculty---don’t see that Nye’s suggestion is an override of current process.
- Faculty---in 2009, the RCC was asked to develop rubric for courses. Not just to approve courses for reading competency.
- Faculty--did we get one more semester to Fall 2019? Nye---yes.

2. Collegial Consultation in Los Rios

IBA for the college and district senate presidents and Chancellor King to discuss collegial consultation

Reports

1. Meeting with Chancellor/ Vice Chancellor---none
2. College Academic Senate President Reports---none
3. District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (Pease)---see Attachment A
4. District Matriculation & Student Success Committee (Lambert)---none
5. District Educational Technology Committee (Dieli)---none
6. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (May)---see Attachment B
7. Los Rios College Federation of Teachers (Presidents/Perrone)---none

Future Agenda Items

Adjourned at: 4:54pm

Future Events

Next DAS meeting – September 18, 2018 Main Conference Room, DO

- LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, September 12, District Office
- ASCCC Area A Meeting, October 12, College of the Sequoias
- LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, October 10, DO
- ASCCC 2018 Fall Plenary Session, November 1-3, Irvine Marriott Hotel

- LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, November 7, Folsom Lake College
- LRCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, December 12, DO
- ASCCC Area A Meeting, March 23,
- ASCCC 2019 Spring Plenary Session, April 11-13, Westin San Francisco Airport
- ASCCC 2019 Career and Noncredit Institute, April 25-27, San Diego
- ASCCC 2019 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 13-16, Sacramento
- ASCCC 2019 Curriculum Institute, July 10-13, Hyatt San Francisco Airport
- ASCCC Events

ATTACHMENT A:

DCCC Report to the District Academic Senate, September 4, 2018

1. Curriculum: All courses and one program on the August 31, 2018 DCCC agenda were approved. New courses and programs will appear on the September Board of Trustees agenda.
2. Competency Committees: Carlos Lopez informed the group that the Academic Senate will appoint competency committee chairs in the next couple of weeks. SCC will chair the next term of the Reading Competency Committee and ARC will chair the next term of both the Math Competency and the Writing Competency Committees.
3. New Designators/Thematic Blocks/Families: The GCOM faculty at SCC requested a slight adjustment to the thematic blocks for the new DDSN designator (approved by DCCC in April, 2018). The change was treated as an informational item and has already been adjusted in Socrates by Phil Smith. The DDSN designator is not a shared designator.
4. Collaboration Requests: There are currently eight open collaboration requests in the District. All eight are new collaborations and the Chairs from all four colleges agreed to monitor progress to keep the outlines moving.
5. SOCRATES Advisory Group (SAG): The biggest news coming out of SAG is the development of the online catalog, which will be fed directly from Socrates. Jamey Nye shared with the DCCC that Phil Smith spent time working on the project this summer. Gabe Ross and Phil Smith will provide a demonstration for the DCCC at the September 28th meeting. This fall, SAG will meet on the second Tuesday of the month in the Chancellor's Conference room from 3:30 to 5:00 PM. The next meeting is Tuesday, September 11, 2018.
6. District Report: Tammy Montgomery showed the group where the PPC list is housed on the District website. To find the latest copy of the PPC list follow this path: District Web Site > Employees > District Academic Senate > PPC Approved Programs.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dyan Pease
DCCC Chair

ATTACHMENT B:
ASCCC Report to DAS, 9-4-2018

1. This academic year, the ASCCC is focusing on four areas that fall under the 10+1 in collaboration with the CCCCCO: Guided Pathways, AB 705 Implementation, Faculty Diversification, and Strong Workforce program. These will be standing agenda items for the ASCCC Executive Committee this year.
2. The Academic Academy this year is all about Guided Pathways and is comprised of workshops to accompany presentations. It will take September 13-15 at the Embassy Suites by Hilton South SF Airport. More information can be found at <https://asccc.org> and click on Events.
3. The Area A meeting is at College of the Sequoias in Visalia on October 12. It is quite a trek down there, so plan early. Some of us will go down the night before.
4. Fall Plenary Session is November 1-3 at the Irvine Marriott – make your hotel reservations early!
5. There have been lots of questions about AB 705 as it affects more than just the disciplines cited in the bill. Please feel free to send your questions to info@asccc.org regarding AB 705, curriculum, prerequisites, corequisites, placement, and such.
6. The ASCCC is currently accepting proposals for disciplines list revisions, Go to <https://asccc.org/disciplines-list> and click on Resources for forms and more information.

: